

Student Feedbacks About 2002 GEM Student Tutorials

June 18, 2003

The followings are some feedbacks from our students to the 2002 GEM student tutorials. Each item represents the opinions from one student. Please refer to them when you prepare your student tutorial talk. Some of the feedbacks are contradictory to each other, so please judge by yourself which one is better for the majority of our students.

- **Most helpful:** More detailed talks especially plasmasphere talk.
Least helpful: Overviews but they're probably most helpful for new students!
Additional comments: Learned lots about the plasmasphere that I had questions about. In particular relating to sharpness of the plasmopause.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Broadening the knowledge of this field.
Least helpful: Should have given the hand outs before the talk.
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Intro, and inner magnetosphere storms.
Least helpful: GGCM
Additional comments: The concept behind substorms became more clearer.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** The good intros into the topics.
Least helpful: Some were a little long.
Additional comments: Overall, a very well run program.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Outstanding problems.
Least helpful:
Additional comments: **Should the level of the talks be:** Increased.
- **Most helpful:** All.
Least helpful:
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.

- **Most helpful:** The pictures of the cat, bear, etc. of course!
Least helpful: There seemed to be too much review.
Additional comments: There should be beer!
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Nice overview and remember of forgotten things.
Least helpful:
Additional comments: This was more repetition for me. But it's nice to see things again.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** E-field and wave-particle talks.
Least helpful: Modeling talks.
Additional comments: Keep talks to time limit! finally understand about shielding E-field.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** I knew nothing about this field, so the overall review was helpful.
Least helpful: Did not have enough background to follow everything, but that is my own fault.
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Area → pictures → basic physics of relevant scientific questions.
Least helpful:
Additional comments: Jerry G. did this. Mention differences in ideas in tutorials that might contradict what might learn in Introduction to Space Physics, books, etc.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Food.
Least helpful: Repeat of last year.
Additional comments: Learned about MHD models.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Review/overview of complete topics (review things you've forgotten and put pieces together in the big picture).
Least helpful: Some went into much more detail than necessary/useful for someone not going into that field.
Additional comments: Found the Goldstein and O'Brien talks very interesting.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** All of Power point presentations were nice -handouts are always good. I though the overview to the magnetosphere was a good idea.
Least helpful: Most of the more in-depth presentations assume too much prior knowledge of jargon, abbreviations, etc.
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.

- **Most helpful:** The broad overview.
Least helpful: When a presentation drowns or gets lost in a detail.
Additional comments: The short intro to waves made me interested in knowing more about this topic.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** SMC.
Least helpful: Simulation model.
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Different persons' work.
Least helpful: None.
Additional comments: None.
Should the level of the talks be: Decreased.
- **Most helpful:** Generalized understanding of the space physics in different regions.
Least helpful: Going too many details.
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:**
Least helpful: Way too long -my attention faded halfway -but I don't see how it could be made shorter, either.
Additional comments: Speakers should say a little more about themselves for new students benefit.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** GGCM
Least helpful:
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Broad subject matter.
Least helpful: Too much detail. I think it would be better to have the big picture. Also, there were some glaring inaccuracies. Somehow the format needs to encourage more discussion and Q&A instead of fully prepared polished Power point presentations.
Additional comments: Could you please make the tutorials available online? I learned a lot about SMCs. Before this tutorial I had no idea what they were.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Broad view of the field.
Least helpful: Some talks should be more general.
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.

- **Most helpful:** Basic knowledge, practical directions, current status, heated topics.
Least helpful: N/A.
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** I found so many aspects of the tutorial to be helpful. I could find it difficult to identify the most helpful.
Least helpful: I did not need some of the initial introductory material on GEM and the magnetosphere which was presented the first. But I did enjoy the relevant talks.
Additional comments: I found Dr. Jerry Goldstein's explanation of penetration electric fields to be the best explanation of that phenomenon across which I have come. Colby Lemon should be commended for doing equipment failure.
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Section II+III seemed to be lower level & easier to get something out of.
Least helpful: GGCM talk was way too long, especially for the end of the day.
Additional comments: Learned more about whistler waves.
Should the level of the talks be: Decreased & kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Jerry's talk on shielding.
Least helpful:
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** General introductions to topics.
Least helpful:
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: Learned more about whistler waves.
- **Most helpful:** That they were given from a student perspective.
Least helpful: Some of them were boring and hard to follow.
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Student based talks.
Least helpful: Too specific in some talks (1 or 2). Keep it broad.
Additional comments:
Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.
- **Most helpful:** Interrelating concepts I have already heard about but was vague on; back-ground on various controversies.
Least helpful: Some were too detailed or generic.
Additional comments: More "recent history" on the different schools of thought, naming names, on e.g., substorm initiation, radiation belt acceleration, global modeling. Along the

lines of “this is what you’ll be hearing about this week.”

Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.

- **Most helpful:** Nice informal atmosphere; and presentation of the global MHD (and others) models.

Least helpful:

Additional comments:

Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.

- **Most helpful:** Introductions, cartoons, easy visualization tools, especially in topics where I have little expertise.

Least helpful: Tiny little figures with data, photocopied from published papers, shown in rapid succession.

Additional comments: Progression of SMC’s, MHD techniques & just a bit of context for this technique.

Should the level of the talks be: Decreased.

- **Most helpful:** I learned wave stuff -EMIC, VLF, Pc. Basically I knew virtually nothing & everything in Maria’s talk was pertinence & helpful.

Least helpful:

Additional comments: Maybe more basic E&M principles that cause phenomena rather than personal research.

Should the level of the talks be: kept the same.

- **Most helpful:** Summarizing outstanding questions.

Least helpful: Discussion of personal research.

Additional comments: Set and enforce a 20 minute maximum!

Should the level of the talks be: Depended on the individual talk.

- **Most helpful:** Very well organized and divided, showed clearly what the different aspects and goals of GEM are

Least helpful: Presentations always better if data/picture in it. not just theory or written explanations.

Additional comments: This really helped me. Being my first year, the overview will help me a lot the rest of the week. I learned that there are excellent magnetospheric models available for people like me who don’t know the details of them. (UCLA)

Should the level of the talks be: Decreased.